



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/814,069

03/31/2004

Mihai Florin Ionescu

24207-10108

5508

62296

7590

04/29/2009

GOOGLE / FENWICK  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA ST.  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/814,069	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IONESCU, MLHAI FLORIN	
	<b>Examiner</b> DENNIS MYINT	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/01/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, and 14-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, and 14-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on December 1, 2008.
2. Claims 1-12, and 14-36 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 34 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on December 1, 2008, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 31, 32, 34, and 36 were amended. This office action is made final.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on December 1, 2008 have been considered but are not moot in view of new ground(s) of rejections.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 14, the claim in lines 3-5 recites “outputting a second category of the plurality of categories, the second category being determined and flagged expired”.

However, the specification of the instant application fails to provide proper antecedent basis for “outputting a second category of the plurality of categories, the second category being determined and flagged expired”. As such, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

Art Unit: 2162

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 17-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata (hereinafter "Doganata", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0220913) in view of Inaba et al., (hereinafter "Inaba", U.S. Patent Number 7054860) and further in view of Fain et. al., (hereinafter "Fain", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0220912).

As per claim 1, Doganata teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 *and PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110* ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user queries are generated, information sources are queried*);

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously received" (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language";***; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new user query may be based on a previously entered user query, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match,*);

(c) “if the search query has been previously entered” (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query** within the context of “computer language”*),

(i) retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query” (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of “computer language,” then **only “computer languages” is returned** as the category*).

Doganata does not explicitly teach the limitations:

(i) (retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query), “the previously stored result set comprising a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles” (the limitation in the parenthesis is taught by Doganata but included for the sake of easy reading);

(ii) “determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query” and

(d) “if the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query”.

On the other hand, Inaba teaches the limitations:

(ii) **“determining whether ( at least a portion) of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query”** (Inaba Figure 1, i.e., *Search Result File Group 129*; Inaba Column 6 Lines 31-34, i.e., *Next, in step 681, the **similar document-searching** program 115 is started to perform a document search on the basis of the searching profile generated in the step 601 and display a search result*; Inaba Column 5 Lines 3-5, i.e., *As will be described later, the search result history file group 129 is a **set of files each saving a search result presented to the user each time** that retrieval is carried out*; Inaba Column 6 Lines 35-52, i.e., *Thereafter, in step 682, the search history saving program 118 is started by inputting user operation information "the seed document is set", and the searching profile and **the search result are saved in a file of the searching profile saving file group 128** and a file of the search result history saving file group 129, respectively. The user operation information referred to herein is a string expressing the content of a user operation such as "the seed document is set" or "a document of document number 10 is evaluated **as desirable**". Through the present step, the searching profile at present and the search result based on the searching profile are saved. Further, the searching profile at present, the search result based on the searching profile and the user operation information "the seed document is set" are all registered as initial information in the search history table 126 by making the correspondence between them. The concrete contents of data saved in the search history table 126 will be described later with reference to FIG. 16*; Inaba Column 6 Lines 63 through Column 7 Line 57, i.e.,

Art Unit: 2162

*Subsequently, when the command is determined to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the search result document in the step 606, the searching profile updating program 116 is started in step 651 to generate user operation information **on the basis of the evaluation inputted by the user** and change the content of the searching profile saving area 124. Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching program 115 is started to perform document search **on the basis of the content of the searching profile changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**. Furthermore, in step 653, the search history saving program 118 is started by using the user operation information generated in the step 651 as an input **to save**, in the search history table 126, the searching profile changed in the step 651 and **the search result obtained in the step 652** by making the correspondence of them with the user operation information).*

(d) **“if the at least (a portion) of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting (the portion) of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query”** (Inaba Figure 1, i.e., *Search Result File Group 129*; Inaba Column 6 Lines 31-34, i.e., *Next, in step 681, the **similar document-searching** program 115 is started to perform a document search on the basis of the searching profile generated in the step 601 and display a search result*; Inaba Column 5 Lines 3-5, i.e., *As will be described later, the search result history file group 129 is a **set of files each saving a search result presented to the user each time that** retrieval is carried out*; Inaba Column 6 Lines 35-52, i.e., *Thereafter, in step 682,*



Art Unit: 2162

*the search history saving program 118 is started by inputting user operation information "the seed document is set", and the searching profile and **the search result are saved in a file of the searching profile saving file group 128** and a file of the search result history saving file group 129, respectively. The user operation information referred to herein is a string expressing the content of a user operation such as "the seed document is set" or "a document of document number 10 is evaluated **as desirable**". Through the present step, the searching profile at present and the search result based on the searching profile are saved. Further, the searching profile at present, the search result based on the searching profile and the user operation information "the seed document is set" are all registered as initial information in the search history table 126 by making the correspondence between them. The concrete contents of data saved in the search history table 126 will be described later with reference to FIG. 16; Inaba Column 6 Lines 63 through Column 7 Line 57, i.e., Subsequently, when the command is determined to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the search result document in the step 606, the searching profile updating program 116 is started in step 651 to generate user operation information **on the basis of the evaluation inputted by the user** and change the content of the searching profile saving area 124. Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching program 115 is started to perform document search **on the basis of the content of the searching profile changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**. Furthermore, in step 653, the search history saving program 118 is started by using the user operation information generated in the step 651 as an input to*

Art Unit: 2162

*save, in the search history table 126, the searching profile changed in the step 651 and **the search result obtained in the step 652** by making the correspondence of them with the user operation information).*

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata to combine with method of Inaba, which teaches determining whether a portion/portions of data/results to be valid or not, so that the resultant method would determine whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a method/technique to “realize improvements in the retrieval accuracy by making it possible to recommence evaluation for a desired search result document” (Inaba Column 2 Lines 60-64).

Doganata in view of Inaba does not explicitly teach the limitations: “the previously stored result set comprising a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles”, and “one of the plurality of categories”.

On the other hand, Fain teaches the limitations:

**“the previously stored result set comprising a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles”** (Fain, Paragraph 0020, i.e.,

*“It is also an object of this invention is to provide users with a customizable search engine that permits users to organize search results listings based upon the commercial nature of the search result and to allow users to specify presentation rules **based upon categories** and user preferences”; Fain, Paragraph 0046, i.e., “system also enables complete customization with regard*

Art Unit: 2162

to the set of criteria used **to categorize search results**, the importance of each such criterion in the determination of such categorization, and the ultimate categorization and presentation of such search results to the user"; Fain, Paragraph 0048, i.e., "Described herein is a customizable system for identifying and **categorizing the records** in or the results of a search of the records in a distributed database, and **for categorizing and presenting the records or search results** according to the commercial nature of the record in a more organized, more easily understood, and therefore, more useful manner. The following descriptions detail how the pages of or the results of a search of the Internet may **be identified and categorized** as commercial and non-commercial (informational), but it is readily understood that the records of a distributed database, including the Internet, may be categorized into **a limitless variety of categories**, including sub -categories of the commercial and non-commercial categories. Other categories may include on-line shopping and advertisements for traditional stores and services. Alternatively, or additionally, the records in or the search results of the records in a distributed database may be categorized and presented geographically, via price range, and by many other criteria according to a variety of user-specified variables" ), and

**"one of the plurality of categories"** (Fain, Paragraph 0048 ).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata in view of Inaba to add the feature of categorizing searching results and presenting search results as categories to the user to the method of Doganata in view of Inaba so

Art Unit: 2162

that the resultant method would teach that the previously stored result set would comprise a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles and would determine whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored search result set is a valid search result set for a search query and would present the search results to the user. One would have been motivated to do so in order to “allow users to specify presentation rules based upon categories and user preferences” (Fain, Paragraph 0020).

As per claim 2, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether a search query has been previously received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries” (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., ***If the user has previously used this query within the context of “computer language”***). Comparing the search query to a list of previously received queries is inherent in said disclosure of Doganata, i.e., Paragraph 0033 of Doganata.

As per claim 3, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that one of the plurality of categories of the result set includes a

Art Unit: 2162

change" (Doganata in view of paragraph 0048 of Fain; Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3; See also, ; Inaba Colum 6 Lines 63 through Column 7 Line 57, i.e., Subsequently, when the command is determined to be a command to input a user's evaluation for the search result document in the step 606, the searching profile updating program 116 is started in step 651 to generate user operation information **on the basis of the evaluation inputted by the user** and change the content of the searching profile saving area 124. Further, in step 652, the similar document-searching program 115 is started to perform document search **on the basis of the content of the searching profile changed** in the step 651 and **display a search result**. Furthermore, in step 653, the search history saving program 118 is started by using the user operation information generated in the step 651 as an input **to save**, in the search history table 126, the searching profile changed in the step 651 and **the search result obtained in the step 652** by making the correspondence of them with the user operation information). Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes.*

As per claim 8, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain teaches the limitation:

“wherein the previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles” (Doganata, Paragraph 0003, i.e., *text document*; Paragraph 0025, i.e., *a document,* ).

As per claim 9, Sommerer in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain teaches the limitation:

“wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query” (Doganata, Paragraph 0023, i.e., *Furthermore, queries may be generated automatically from the keywords that represent a category*; and Paragraph 0020, i.e., *The categories effectively allow **a user query to be expanded** into a number of keywords*).

As per claim 10, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain teaches the limitation:

“wherein the previously stored result set associated with at least one of the following: a real-time event, a historical event, **an indexable event**, a non-indexable event” (Doganata, Paragraph 0039, i.e., *the document retriever 140 **catalogs** results from each of the information source 180*).

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 10 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

9. Claims 4-7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Fain and Baidya et al., (hereinafter “Baidya”, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0046311).

As per claim 4, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of does not explicitly teach the limitation: “wherein determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set of the search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set”.

Baidya teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set” (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information*; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis*; and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine*; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database*; and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).



At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain, which caches previously visited web content, to combine with the method of Baidya, which updates caches of web content on periodic basis, so that the resultant method would determine whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set. One would have been motivated to do so because *there is a need for a method and system for automatically, or semi-atomically, categorizing and classifying large volumes of information and keeping the information up to date so that it is current and reliable* (Baidya, Paragraph 0012).

As per claim 5, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query comprises determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed from a date associated with the result set” (Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information*; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis*; and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine*; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database*; and

Art Unit: 2162

Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 6, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“wherein retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following: retrieving the result set from an optical disc, retrieving a result set from a hard drive, retrieving the result set from an external data storage medium, retrieving a result set from an external data storage reader, and retrieving a result set from a data store on the client-side” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*).

As per claim 7, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“wherein receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device” (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information offline* ).

As per claim 11, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

“If the search query has not been previously received” (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The **new user query** may be based on a previously entered user query, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query*)

(i) receiving a new result set (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query; Paragraph 0023, i.e., The keywords are sent to information sources and the returned results are analyzed for ranking*);

(ii) “storing the new result set and the search query in an offline-accessible data store” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline***); and

(iii) “indexing the result and the search query for subsequent retrieval of the new result set” (Baidya, Paragraph 0050, i.e., *thereafter, categorize and index the information for storage in the InfoBase*).

As per claim 14, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“*wherein outputting at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query as a search result of the search query comprise: outputting a second category of the plurality of categories, the second query being determined and flagged expired*” ( Doganata in view of paragraph 0048 of Fain and further in view of Baidya; Baidya, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information*; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis*; and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine*; Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database*; and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065) .

As per claim 15, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“ wherein storing the new result set and the search query in the offline-accessible data store comprises at least one of the following: storing the result set on an optical disc, storing the result set on a hard drive, storing the result set on an external data storage medium, storing the result set on an external data storage reader, and storing the result set on a data store on the client-side”

Art Unit: 2162

(Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information offline*).

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

As per claim 22, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“ wherein the program code for retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query comprises at least one of the following:  
program code for retrieving the result set from an optical disc, program code for retrieving a result set from a hard drive, program code for retrieving the result set from an external data storage medium, program code for retrieving a result set from an external data storage reader, and program code for retrieving a result set from a data store on the client-side” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*).

As per claim 23, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

“wherein the program code for receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, program code for receiving the search query from a user operating an online client-side device” (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information **offline***).

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 30 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

10. Claims 29 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Fain and further

Art Unit: 2162

in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny et al., (hereinafter “Denny”) (U.S. Patent Number 7082428).

As per claim 29, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of in view of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: “comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries”

On the other hand, Denny teaches the limitation:

“comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries” (Denny, Abstract).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of comparing current queries to pervious queries, as taught by Denny, to the method of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would compare current queries to the previous queries. One would have been motivated to do so in order to do away with *multiple duplicative searches* (Denny, Column 1 Lines 62-67).

As per claim 34, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitations:

(a) “receiving a search query” (Doganata, Figure 1: USER I/F 105 and *PERSONAL QUERY MANAGER 110* ; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *new user queries are generated, information sources are queried*) ;

(b) “determining whether the search query has been previously received” (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query***

Art Unit: 2162

*within the context of “computer language”;*; and Paragraph 0022, i.e., *The new user query may be based on **a previously entered user query**, which is given its own personal category or is related to a general category. **If the user enters a user query that has no corresponding category**, then it is beneficial to associate a category to the query. Once a category is associated with the query, then the corresponding keywords and the ranked list of information sources are also associated with the query;* and Paragraph 0036, i.e., *If there is no match;* and Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);*

(c) “if the search query has not been previously received,

(i) receiving the first result set” (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);*

(ii) “storing the first result set in an offline-accessible data store” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(iii) “indexing the first result set for subsequent retrieval” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and



(d) “if the search query has been previously received” (Denny, Abstract,),  
(i) “retrieving a previously stored result set associated with the search query” (Doganata, Paragraph 0022, i.e., *If the user has previously used this query within the context of "computer language," then **only "computer languages" is returned** as the category*) “the previously stored result comprises a plurality of categories each of which comprising one or more articles” ( Fain, Paragraph 0048 );

(ii) “determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result for the search query” (Inaba in view of Fain paragraph 0048 as applied to claim 1 above);

(iii) “if the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined to be a valid search result set for the search query, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set” (Inaba in view of Fain paragraph 0048 as applied to claim 1 above); and

(iv) “if the at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is determined not to be a valid search result set for the search query” (Inaba in view of Fain Paragraph 0048 as applied to claim 1 above),

(1) “receiving the second result set” (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) “storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

Art Unit: 2162

(3) “indexing the second result set for subsequent retrieval” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

As per claim 35, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether a search query has been previously received comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously received search queries” (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data sources*).

As per claim 36, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining whether at least one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set associated with the search query is a valid search result set for the search query comprises determining at least **one of the following**: determining that one of the plurality of categories of the previously result set is new, determining that one of the plurality of categories of the previously stored result set includes a change, determining that a new article

Art Unit: 2162

exists in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new article has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that an article has been changed in the previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new email has been sent in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new web page has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a web page has been changed in a category of the previously stored result set, determining that a new document has been received in a category of the previously stored result set, and determining that a new document has been generated in a category of the previously stored result set” (Doganata in view of Fain paragraph 0048; that is, Doganata, Paragraph 0046, i.e., *The information source analyzer 160 sends the ranked list 161 of information sources 180 to the linguistic library 170, along with the associated query and category. When the linguistic library 170 receives the ranked list of information sources 180 through link 161, the linguistic library 170 updates the category with the ranked list 161 of information sources 180, as described below in reference to FIG. 3*). Note that the category is updated because new set of results from the information source analyzer includes changes),

(1) “receiving the second result set” (Denny, Abstract; The method of Denny can retrieve as many results sets as necessary);

(2) “storing the second result set in an offline-accessible data store” (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

11. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Rivers-Moore et al, (hereinafter “Rivers”, U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0267813).

As per claim 33, Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of and further in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

“receiving a request for an article, the article being accessible via a network” (Doganata, Figure 1; Paragraph 0028, i.e., *Internet databases, Internet search engines or public or private databases*);

“determining whether the article is valid” (Doganata, Paragraph 0033, i.e., *If the user has **previously used this query** within the context of “computer language”*);

“if the article is determined not to be valid, retrieving the article via the network” (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039, i.e., if the query is new, that is, the query was not entered/received before; See claim 1 for details);

“retrieving the article via the network” (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, Paragraph 0022, and Paragraph 0039);

“outputting the article on the client device” (Doganata, Paragraph 0024, i.e., *the present invention has the ability to return **a higher percentage of relevant documents** to the user*);

“if the article is not stored in the offline-accessible data store” (Baidya, Paragraph 0050k i.e., *Back-End Processing Engine* ). Note that most of Baidya’s method and system are implemented online, i.e., data is not stored in offline-accessible. Only in Paragraph 0515, Baidya recites an alternative embodiment wherein data is stored in offline-accessible store.

Doganata in view Berg and further in view of Baidya not explicitly teach the limitations:

“determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device”; and “if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store”; and “retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store”;

Rivers teaches the limitations:

“determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device” (Rivers Paragraph 0088, i.e., *determine if the solution is available locally for offline use*); and

“if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store”; and “retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store” (Rivers Paragraph 0089, i.e., *to determine if the solution 124 is on the computer (cached or available offline) and access the solution*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining whether data is stored in an offline-accessible or not, as taught by Rivers, to the method and system of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Baidya so that the resultant method and system would determine if the data is stored in offline store or not. One would have been motivated to do so in order to efficiently gather electronic information (Rivers, Paragraph 0011).

12. Claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya and further in view Shaath et al., (hereinafter “Shaath”) (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20060010150).

As per claim 12, Doganata in view Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitation: “determining expiration data for the result set”.

Shaath teaches the limitation: “determining expiration data for the result set” (Paragraph 0030, i.e., *it will expire*; Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates*; and Paragraph 0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date*).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining expiration data, taught by Shaath, to method of Doganata in view of Inaba and further in view of Fain and further in view of Baidya so that the resultant method would

Art Unit: 2162

determine expiration data. One would have been motivated to do so in order to remove expired data, which is notoriously well known in the art.

As per claim 16, Doganata in view of Berg and further in view of Baidya and further in view of Shaath teaches the limitation:

“wherein (f) determining expiration data for the result set comprises determining expiration data for at least one of the plurality of categories of the result set, and displaying the expiration data for the at least one of the plurality of categories of the result set” (Shaath, Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates*; and Paragraph 0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date*; and 0032, i.e., *completely transparent to the user*).

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Claim 32 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a computer usable medium rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax



Art Unit: 2162

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-5629.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dennis Myint/  
Examiner AU-2162

/Jean B. Fleurantin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162